

**Motivating pro-group behaviour:
Degree of identification and type of anonymity as determinants of the
choice to work on behalf of a low status group**

The very existence of a group may depend on its ability to motivate its members to stick together and strive for the achievement of the group's goals. In low status groups, this ability is especially relevant: if group members cannot be stimulated to work on the improvement of the group's status, the group's standing remains relatively poor and as a consequence part of its members may prefer to direct themselves towards social mobility to a more highly evaluated group (Ellemers, 1993; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The more group members do so, the less likely the group is to improve its lower standing, and the more disadvantaged will be those who, due to objective or subjective obstacles, do not have the opportunity to leave the group. In this paper, we examine social identity and contextual determinants of group members' choices to stand by their low status ingroup and strive for an improvement of the group's position. Specifically, we start by discussing the role of degree of identification with a group in determining pro-group behaviour. Subsequently, we examine how contextual factors associated with anonymity manipulations are likely to affect low and high identifiers' willingness to work on behalf of their low status ingroup.

The effect of degree of identification

Previous research on people's reactions to membership in low status groups has revealed that degree of identification with the group is a crucial determinant of displays of pro-group behaviour (Doosje, Ellemers, & Spears, 1999; Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 1997; Kelly, 1993; Ouwerkerk, Ellemers, & De Gilder, 1999; Spears, Doosje, & Ellemers, 1997, 1999; Wann & Branscombe, 1990). Indeed, social identity theory and self-categorisation theory postulate that identification with a given social group is accompanied by the internalisation of group norms and interests, and their adoption as personally relevant values and goals (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). It seems to follow that the stronger a group member's identification with a group and its goals, the greater his or her willingness to strive for the improvement of the group's status should be. Consistent with this view, previous research has shown that differences in the degree to which group members identify with a low status ingroup are consistently associated

with the extent to which group members exert themselves for the achievement of the group's goals (Barreto & Ellemers, in press; Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1997; James & Cropanzano, 1994). With regard to preferred strategy for status improvement, whereas high identifiers tend to choose to work on behalf of the group, low identifiers generally prefer to strive for individual mobility into a higher status group.

Given this state of affairs, the crucial question seems to be how low identifiers can be motivated to value the group's interests and strive for the improvement of its standing. This question seems even more pertinent given that often those group members who identify the least with a low status ingroup are highly competent group members who could possibly make a valuable contribution to the group's improvement (Ellemers, Van Knippenberg, De Vries, & Wilke, 1988). In this paper we will examine how anonymity manipulations may play a role in this process. In fact, previous research has shown that anonymity manipulations may help elucidate the processes through which group members may be motivated to adopt the norms of the group (e.g., Barreto & Ellemers, in press; Postmes & Spears, this volume). We will therefore start by considering how anonymity has been conceived and manipulated, and with which effects it has been associated. Subsequently, we will focus on anonymity to the ingroup and dedicate greater attention to the effects that different types of anonymity may have on low and high identifiers' willingness to work on the improvement of a low status ingroup.

The effects of anonymity

Contrary to what was traditionally assumed (e.g., Le Bon, 1895/1995; Tarde, 1890/1921), research on the social identity model of deindividuation effects (SIDE model) has shown that anonymity may be associated with an *increase* rather than a decrease in the adoption of group norms (Reicher, Spears, & Postmes, 1995; Spears & Lea, 1994). For instance, Spears, Lea, & Lee (1990) found that, during computer mediated discussions, group members followed group norms more closely when seated in separate cubicles, than when facing each other in the same room (see also Lea, Spears, & De Groot, 1999; Postmes, 1997; Postmes & Spears, 1998; Reicher, 1984). From a self-categorisation perspective (Turner et al., 1987), these authors argued that group members internalise the norms of the groups with which they identify and therefore do not need to be in the presence of the group in order to display normative behaviour. On the contrary, the presence of other group members could in fact function so as to decrease salience of group membership, since it allows group members to focus on individual differences within the group (the *cognitive component* of the SIDE model; see also Postmes, Spears, & Lea, 1999; Reicher et al. 1995). This reduced salience of group membership in the presence of others would in turn result in a decrease of normative expressions. By contrast, anonymous circumstances were seen to favour the perception of the group as an homogeneous unity, promoting depersonalised self-perception, and eliciting group normative expressions.

However, results of empirical investigations into the effects of anonymity have not been entirely consistent, and effects opposite to what was predicted have also been

found (see also Postmes & Spears, 1998; Postmes, et al. 1999; Postmes, Spears & Lea, in press). Abrams, Wetherell, Cochrane, Hogg, & Turner (1990), for instance, showed that, when judging the size of stimulus lines in a replication of Asch's (1956) paradigm, participants were more influenced by the ingroup when they were asked to state their responses aloud than when their answers were to remain anonymous (see also Barreto & Ellemers, in press; Batson, Ahmad, Yin, Bedell, Johnson, Templin, & Whiteside, 1999; Noel, Wann, & Branscombe, 1995). Although these authors also attributed the effect of anonymity to variations in salience of group membership, the precise effect proposed by Abrams et al. (1990), opposite to that posited by the SIDE model, was that co-presence of group members was said to increase salience of group membership.

While at first sight these results seem to be inconsistent with each other, a closer look at the research in question reveals that this is not necessarily the case (see also Postmes & Spears, 1998). In what follows we will examine some aspects that are likely to determine how anonymity manipulations are likely to affect group members' responses. Specifically, we will argue that the effect of anonymity on group members' behaviour will depend on the particular *ways in which it is conceived*. It is our belief that the systematic examination of different aspects of the methodology that has been used is likely to contribute to the reconciliation of previous research. More importantly, the close examination of these various aspects is likely to provide further insight into the diverse processes through which group members may be motivated to follow group norms.

Types of anonymity

When examining the effects of anonymity it is important to recognise that anonymity is not an absolute concept, but instead gains meaning by reference to a context in which people are *less* anonymous. That is, what we talk about when we talk about anonymity is defined by reference to the specific situations that are being contrasted with each other. As a consequence, it is possible to find considerable variation in what have been regarded as anonymous circumstances. For instance, in a few studies, anonymity was compared with a situation in which participants were held accountable to the ingroup for their responses (Barreto & Ellemers, in press; Batson et al., 1999; Ellemers, Van Dyck, Hinkle, & Jacobs, 1999; Noel et al., 1995). Here, anonymity corresponds to the *lack of accountability* pressures. By contrast, Abrams et al. (1990, study 2) varied whether or not co-present participants were required to state their responses aloud, regarding anonymity as the *privacy of responses*. Another conceptualisation was used by Spears and colleagues (1990) who kept responses public in all conditions and, instead, varied whether or not participants could *see each other*.

Although some aspects of anonymity manipulations may often co-vary in natural situations, they can be seen as theoretically independent, and associated with quite different effects. Specifically, people may anticipate being held accountable without having to actually state their responses aloud, or knowing what other participants say. In such cases, accountability is likely to primarily introduce concerns with self-presentation to

others, which is likely to result in responses in line with the audience's norms. Likewise, manipulations of visibility to the ingroup do not necessarily imply accountability pressures. Specifically, visibility of respondents to each other is likely to be associated with greater focus on interpersonal differences, undermining salience of group membership. In addition to this more cognitive effect, visibility of group members' responses is likely to be associated with a greater clarity of the group norm, as well as with the opportunity to communicate with and persuade others. The specific effect of these independent manipulations is likely to be determined by how the remaining aspects are controlled for. So, for instance, if all respondents are visible to the ingroup, the manipulation of visibility of responses is likely to be accompanied by self-presentational concerns, which may result in an increase in pro-group responses. However, this is less likely to happen if respondents are not in view of each other.

Another aspect that will determine the effects of anonymity manipulations is the nature of the particular audience to which participants are not anonymous. In fact, among other variations in procedures employed to manipulate anonymity, previous studies differ from each other with respect to *whom* participants were made anonymous. While in some studies participants were rendered anonymous to the ingroup (e.g., Barreto & Ellemers, in press; Batson et al., 1999; Noel et al., 1995; Postmes, Spears, Sakhel, & De Groot, 1998), in others they were made anonymous to the outgroup (e.g., Reicher & Levine, 1994), to both ingroup and outgroup (e.g., Postmes, 1997, study 4; Spears et al., 1990), or even to the experimenter (Reicher, Levine, & Gordijn, 1998). Clearly, the effect of an audience is likely to be shaped by the characteristics of the specific audience in question. For instance, whereas accountability to the ingroup is likely to result in endorsement of ingroup norms (Barreto & Ellemers, in press), accountability to the outgroup may result in the opposite effect, that is, in a moderation of the expression of ingroup norms (Reicher & Levine, 1994).

In short, anonymity effects on the adoption of group norms seem to vary widely. These variations can be associated with the diversity of ways in which anonymity has been conceived and manipulated. It seems reasonable to anticipate that these variations in procedure may be associated with different psychological processes that will in turn result in distinct responses. Therefore, in order to understand anonymity effects, it seems necessary to gain a better understanding of the psychological processes underlying different manipulations. The closer examination of these processes will in turn offer further insight into the different ways through which group members may be persuaded to follow group norms. In what follows, we endeavour to examine such processes by discussing empirical evidence regarding the effects of *anonymity to the ingroup*. In doing this, our main goal is to examine how specific manipulations of anonymity may serve to motivate group members to work on behalf of group improvement, especially when lacking an initial motivation to do so.

Anonymity to the ingroup

The study of the effects of anonymity to the ingroup is likely to be particularly informative in the analysis of processes of social influence (see also Barreto & Ellemers,

in press; Postmes & Spears, this volume). In particular, the examination of the effects of accountability to the ingroup is likely to inform us to what extent group norms are internalised, or merely followed under surveillance by other ingroup members (see also Plant & Devine, 1998). In addition, the investigation of visibility to other ingroup members is likely to establish what conditions undermine or instead facilitate the cognitive representation of the group as a salient basis for the self-regulation of behaviour. In the following sections we will discuss how manipulations of accountability and of visibility to the ingroup may influence group members to follow the norms of the group. In this discussion, we will dedicate close attention to the role of degree of identification in moderating the effects of anonymity manipulations.

Accountability to the ingroup and strategic motivations

Studies focusing on the effects of ingroup accountability generally manipulate the expectation that participants' responses will have to be shared with and justified to the remaining ingroup members, rather than being kept private (Barreto & Ellemers, in press; Batson et al., 1999; Noel et al. 1995; see also Tetlock, 1996). Although research within the SIDE model has mainly focused on accountability to the outgroup, the effects of accountability to the ingroup may be included under what this model designates as *strategic* behaviour. Strategic behaviour corresponds to the monitoring of the expression of one's internal preferences due to concerns with self-presentation, and generally results in responses in line with the audience's norms (see also Baumeister, 1982; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Martin, 1988; Plant & Devine, 1998; Raven & Kruglanski, 1970; William, Harkins, & Latane, 1981; *inter alia*).

The processes underlying the display of strategic forms of behaviour will differ depending on the audience at hand. Strategic responses to an ingroup audience, in particular, are seen to stem from a fundamental desire to ensure positive evaluation by others (Barreto & Ellemers, in press; Noel et al. 1995; see also, Baumeister, 1982; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Goffman, 1959; Schlenker, 1980). Accountability to the ingroup should then promote pro-group behaviour through an *interpersonal* process of normative influence (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955; see also Kelley, 1952).

Recent investigation of social influence processes has tended to neglect the role interpersonal processes may play in motivating group members to attend to the norms of the group. Self-categorisation theory, in particular, has argued that interpersonal processes lie at the wrong level in the analysis of pro-group behaviour. Turner and his colleagues (1987, e.g.) have defended that pro-group expressions stem from the salience of valued identities, whose cognitive representation does not require the presence of other ingroup members. Although this seems to constitute an important advancement in the understanding of group phenomena, it seems to only address the psychology of those group members that identify strongly with the group. Indeed, we have previously argued that this conceptualisation of social influence as an identity process only may have to date limited our ability to actually comprehend the various manners through which a group may be able to influence its members (Barreto & Ellemers, in press; Ellemers, Barreto, & Spears, 1999; see also Postmes

& Spears, 1999). In particular, we have argued that pro-group behaviour may stem both from the internalisation of group norms that accompanies identification with a group, and from mere public compliance, when group norms are not internalised. Specifically, when group norms are internalised, as when identification with the group is high, accountability should not add much to group members' already high readiness to follow the group norm. However, while low identifiers may not be generally inclined to regard group norms and goals as self-relevant, they may be motivated to do so when vulnerable to disapproval by others, that is, when accountable to the ingroup for their responses. Thus, degree of identification with a group should moderate whether accountability to the ingroup will function so as to motivate group members to follow the norms of the group.

We have tested these predictions by comparing low and high identifiers' choice of status enhancement strategy, under conditions of anonymity and conditions of accountability to the ingroup (Barreto & Ellemers, in press, study 1). The results showed that accountability to the ingroup increased choices to work on group status improvement among low identifiers, but that it did not affect high identifiers, who always chose to work with the group. That is, consistent with previous research, high identifiers showed a consistent tendency to benefit the group (Doosje, Ellemers, & Spears, 1999; Turner et al., 1987). By contrast, low identifiers resisted in doing so under anonymous conditions, but were motivated to focus on group improvement when additional self-presentation considerations were introduced by accountability manipulations (see also Ellemers, Barreto, & Spears, 1999).

In a second study (Barreto & Ellemers, in press, study 2), we manipulated whether the group seemed to prefer its members to focus on individual or group improvement as a status enhancement strategy (group norm). The results revealed that high identifiers acted according to the group norm irrespective of accountability, working on individual improvement when that was normative, and on group improvement when that was preferred. By contrast, again, low identifiers only followed the group norm when accountable to the group. In order to gain further insight into the processes at hand, participants were asked to what extent they had been concerned with the group during attempts at status improvement. Responses to this question remained anonymous in all conditions. High identifiers stated having been concerned with group improvement in all conditions, irrespective of the specific manner in which they had worked. By contrast, low identifiers reported having had no interest in improving the group, despite the fact that they had actually chosen to work with the group when that was the norm and they were accountable for their responses. This supports our contention that although low and high identifiers displayed similar behaviour when accountable to the ingroup, they did so on the basis of different motivations: whereas high identifiers acted out of an intrinsic concern with the fate of the group, low identifiers seem to have merely responded to interpersonal pressures to comply with the audience's norm. In addition, these results show that a similar motivation to favour the group, as that of high identifiers in the different conditions, may result in different forms of behaviour, that are dictated by what the group considers normative.

In sum, the results of these studies provide evidence for our claim that the group may be able to influence its members both through identity processes that imply the

internalisation of group norms, and through interpersonal processes of presentation of the individual self. Degree of identification with the ingroup determines whether one or the other type of influence will occur, and thus also under what conditions this influence will be manifested.

Visibility to the ingroup

As we have indicated above, another way in which effects of anonymity have been examined is by comparing anonymity with visibility to the ingroup. Visibility to the ingroup may refer either to the disclosure of personal information (pictures or summarised biographies), or to the visibility of participants' responses to each other. Diverging results in previous research can be traced to differences in the type of information that is disclosed to the ingroup. Specifically, studies that have manipulated whether or not information about other group members' *attitudes* is made known to the ingroup have revealed different results from those found in studies in which the disclosure of information regarding other group members' *appearance* has been manipulated. For instance, Abrams et al. (1990) varied whether or not participants' *responses* were public to the ingroup, while they kept participants visible to each other in all conditions. Here, the results revealed an increase in conformity to the group norm under conditions of visibility of *responses* to the ingroup. By contrast, Lea, Spears, & De Groot (1999) manipulated whether *respondents* could or not see each other while exchanging opinions, while responses on the dependent measures were private in all conditions. These authors found that responses were more normative when group members were *not visible* to each other (see also Postmes, 1997).

This analysis seems to suggest that pro-group responses may ensue either from anonymity of respondents and their responses (by promoting depersonalisation of self-interest), or from the disclosure of information regarding *both* other ingroup members' appearance and their opinions (by eliciting concerns with self-presentation). Thus, it may be that the presence of some personal information only serves to undermine the psychological significance of the group, promoting individualistic forms of behaviour, whereas the combination of the two types of information may actually render within group interaction more meaningful and motivating. We have examined this possibility by separately manipulating visibility of responses and visibility of respondents, and examining their effects on group members' willingness to work on group improvement (Barreto & Ellemers, 1999b). Consistent with the analysis made here, we expected pro-group responses to be greater both under conditions of total anonymity to the ingroup, and when both respondents and their responses were visible to the ingroup. However, we also expected degree of identification to function as a moderator of this effect of anonymity manipulations. As in previous research, we expected *high identifiers* to be consistently concerned with the improvement of the ingroup, irrespective of anonymity manipulations. Anonymity was predicted to have an effect only on *low identifiers*' choices to work on behalf of group improvement. That is, low identifiers were expected to work on behalf of the

group both when totally anonymous to the ingroup (when depersonalised), and when totally visible to the ingroup (when concerned with self-presentation to other ingroup members).

Moreover, we expected that pro-group expressions in conditions of total anonymity to the ingroup would stem from a different process from that involved in conditions of total visibility to the ingroup. In fact, the process proposed within the SIDE model to underlie responses under *anonymous* conditions, i.e., an increased salience of group membership, is precisely dependent on the inability to discern differences within the group. It follows that when differences within the group are highly visible (i.e. when both participants and their responses are visible to the ingroup) pro-group behaviour cannot stem from a similar process. Instead, since what characterises a situation of *total visibility to the ingroup* is the ability to match participants to their responses, it seems reasonable to expect that self-presentation processes may be involved. That is, low identifiers are likely to increase adoption of pro-group behaviour when totally visible to the ingroup with the aim of providing a positive image of themselves. As we discussed earlier, if this self-presentation is similar to that associated with accountability manipulations, pro-group expressions merely serve the instrumental goal of protecting self-image, and consequently we may expect no increase in identification in this condition. However, visibility of respondents and their responses to the ingroup does not necessarily imply accountability, in the sense of a requirement to share *and* justify responses to the ingroup (see e.g., Tetlock, 1996). Therefore, the process of self-presentation involved here may, instead of being caused by a need of self-protection, also stem from the opportunity to forge bonds with other group members by projecting an impression of self and forming an impression of others. If so, then self-presentation here may in fact be associated with an increase in identification, developed out of the creation of interpersonal bonds within the group.

The results of this study showed that participants' *choice of strategy for status improvement* was consistent with our predictions. Whereas the manipulations of visibility did not affect high identifiers' behaviour, they did affect low identifiers' choice of strategy for status improvement. Indeed, low identifiers worked more often with the group when totally anonymous to the ingroup, and when both responses and respondents were visible to the ingroup. In addition, analysis of participants' reported *concerns with the group* showed that while high identifiers were equally concerned with the group across experimental conditions, low identifiers were more concerned with the group when both responses and respondents were anonymous to the ingroup. Analysis of covariance revealed that this increase in concern with the group actually mediated low identifiers' choices to work with the group when totally anonymous. In turn, *both* low and high identifiers reported greater *self-to-group similarity* when totally visible to the ingroup. This increase in judgements of self-to-group similarity mediated the effect of the manipulations on low identifiers' choices to work with the group when both responses and respondents were visible to the ingroup. In addition, *both* low and high identifiers reported higher *degrees of identification after group interaction* when participants were totally visible to the ingroup. Moreover, a tendency was revealed for identification among low and high identifiers to be higher

also under conditions of total anonymity to the ingroup, although this was not statistically significant. Analysis of covariance, however, revealed that degree of identification did *not* mediate the effect of the manipulations on low identifiers' responses. That is, although context manipulations also affected degree of identification, this did not play a role in predicting behaviour, suggesting that the increase in identification may have stemmed from the particular form of interaction with the group that was evoked in that context, rather than having caused it.

In sum, low identifiers were motivated to work with the group in two different circumstances, and due to distinct considerations. Low identifiers' choices to work with the group under conditions of *total anonymity to the ingroup* seem to have stemmed from an increased concern with the group's fate. Although this condition seemed to be associated with an increase in identification, this was not significant, and did not predict low identifiers' choices. By contrast, when *both responses and respondents were visible*, low identifiers' choices were mediated by judgements of self-to-group similarity. Again, although this situation was significantly associated with an increase in ingroup identification, there is no evidence that this was the motivation underlying low identifiers' behaviour.

Again, these results indicate that different contextual conditions related to anonymity manipulations may be associated with pro-group behaviour. However, the psychological processes underlying similar forms of behaviour may be quite different. One important consequence is that responses on different measures are likely to show different patterns, which correspond to the expression of distinct motivations for the same behaviour. This finding highlights the importance of considering various forms of identity expression in order to investigate the processes implicated by distinct contexts. In addition, it must be noted that whether anonymity may be said to have increased, decreased, or to have had no effect at all on normative responses depends on the comparisons that we choose to make. In this sense, the results of this study seem consistent with an analysis of previous research in terms of which anonymity manipulations have been investigated. However, to date we know of little research that has examined the role of degree of identification with the ingroup in moderating effects of anonymity manipulations, and therefore comparisons with previous studies are to be made with reservations. Further research should therefore attempt to replicate and extend these findings.

Conclusions

An analysis of previous investigations of the effects of anonymity manipulations on pro-group behaviour confirmed that while high identifiers seem to be consistent in their loyalty to the group's goals, low identifiers seem more reluctant to display pro-group behaviour. However, our analysis also shows that despite this reluctance, low identifiers may be motivated by various circumstances to follow the group's norms and focus on the improvement of the group's status. In specific, low identifiers may be led to work with the group 1) when rendered accountable to the ingroup, 2) in conditions of total anonymity to the ingroup, and 3) in circumstances where both

respondents and their responses are visible to the ingroup. Generally, we may say that normative expressions are facilitated when either very little or very much personal information is disclosed (see also Sassenberg, in this volume). Although it has certainly been useful to distinguish between low and high identifiers with regard to their inclinations towards the group, the findings discussed in this paper suggest that this distinction should not be taken to mean that it is impossible to attempt to persuade low identifiers to focus on group goals. In fact, these results support the view that we cannot limit social influence to a process of identification with a group and its goals, and that instead other processes may underlie the endorsement of group norms (see also McGarty, this volume).

In fact, our analysis suggests that group members may be persuaded to focus on group goals through different processes. High identifiers seem to work on behalf of the group out of an internalised concern with the group and its goals. Consistent with self-categorisation theory, identification with a group seems to be accompanied by the adoption of group norms and goals as self-relevant, which is reflected in pro-group behaviour across a wide variety of contexts (Hogg & Turner, 1987; Turner et al., 1987). In turn, when identification with the group is weak, group and individual interests are likely to stand in contradiction, and therefore additional motivations may be necessary for pro-group behaviour to ensue. The evidence discussed in this paper suggests that accountability to the ingroup may introduce such additional motivations: by rendering group members vulnerable to disapproval by others, accountability to the ingroup promotes pro-group behaviour among low identifiers as a strategy to avoid such disapproval (Barreto & Ellemers, in press).

Interpersonal processes also seem to lie at the basis of group influence when low identifiers are totally visible to the ingroup, even if not explicitly accountable for their responses. In fact, among those who initially identify weakly with the group, visibility of participants and their responses to the ingroup seems to promote a concern with similarity to other ingroup members, both in general self-definition and in behavioural displays. The increase in identification associated with this condition may be taken to indicate that the process here is of a different nature from that elicited by accountability manipulations. In fact, although we do not dispute that self-presentation may constitute an important part of both processes, it would seem that its consequences may depend on what precisely motivates self-presentational concerns. In particular, when self-presentation stems from a need to justify one's actions it does not seem to create commitment to the group, whereas conditions akin to face-to-face interaction may be associated with an increase in group identification. However, in our studies, this increase in identification was not at the origin of low identifiers' behaviour, and rather it seemed to be a by-product of the manipulations, or even a result of within-group interaction. Our suggestion is that total visibility to the ingroup encourages group members' interest in each other, thereby facilitating within group interaction (see also Postmes & Spears, this volume). This interaction, in turn, may grant the group membership psychological reality, giving place to identification with the group. That a situation commonly associated with self-presentation processes is here associated with stronger identification is in fact consistent with the idea that social identity and self-presentation processes may be closely related, and

that their separation may at times not only be difficult but also not very informative (see e.g., Emler & Reicher, 1995).

A different process seems to be at hand when participants are totally anonymous to the ingroup. Indeed, total anonymity to the ingroup seems to have motivated low identifiers to focus on group improvement out of an increase in concern with the group's goals. The lack of any other information besides group membership and status seems to have worked so as to increase focus on group membership, rendering it as a more relevant basis for regulation of behaviour. Self-to-group similarity did not play any role in this condition, further supporting our conclusion that there is a difference between the underlying processes in the two conditions of visibility. Although this condition also seemed to be associated with an increase in identification, this was not significant and, again, did not mediate pro-group behaviour.

It should be noted that an important implication of the view that degree of identification depends on the characteristics of the particular context under examination is that group members that initially award little importance to a given membership may over time come to focus on that same group and its goals if contextually stimulated (Turner, 1999). This may serve to draw an important distinction between the implications of variations in degree of identification and in salience of individual vs. group identity, as manipulated in previous investigations of the effects of anonymity (see e.g., Spears et al., 1990). In fact, when addressed as an individual (i.e., the 'individual salience' condition in the study by Spears et al.), the opportunity to develop a higher degree of identification is constrained. However, if addressed as a group member (i.e., the 'group salience' condition), and required to be involved in group tasks, those that initially prefer to disregard their group identity, may come to award it importance in a different time and context (see also Barreto & Ellemers, 1999a; Tajfel, 1981; Turner et al., 1987). In sum, for group identities to matter in specific contexts people have to be able to perceive themselves as included in a given category.

The analysis made in this paper also seems to resolve some of the inconsistencies within previous investigations of the effects of anonymity. In this paper, we have argued that the effects of anonymity must be understood by reference to a range of aspects. Firstly, the effects of anonymity must not be mentioned in isolation from what exactly is being manipulated and compared. The discussion of the effects of visibility to the ingroup, for instance, shows that depending on the specific procedures employed, group members may be said to remain unaffected by the manipulations, or rather to be motivated to increase, or decrease normative displays. Secondly, degree of identification seems to be a crucial moderator of the effects of anonymity manipulations. In regard to certain forms of identity expression, high identifiers do not show any variation across contexts, while low identifiers may be more clearly affected by the manipulation of anonymity to the ingroup. However, this is not to say that anonymity does not affect high identifiers, whose statements of similarity of self-to-group and degree of identification after group interaction did show an effect of anonymity to the ingroup.

In fact, an additional point regarding the effects of anonymity to the ingroup worth mentioning is that the patterns that are likely to be found depend on the specific measures employed. Indeed, if different circumstances are associated with distinct

processes, we are likely to find that while one aspect of group membership is stressed in one context, another is enhanced in a different context (Barreto & Ellemers, 1999b). In fact, even closely related aspects of one's group membership may each have their own specific context of relevance (see also Ellemers, Kortekaas, & Ouwerkerk, 1999). In addition, different responses may result from similar motivations, whereas distinct motivations may underlie similar behavioural displays (Barreto & Ellemers, in press). The implication is that a more complete picture of the effects of context may be obtained if variations across measures are not taken as a nuisance, but rather as informing us about the particular ways in which diverse aspects of one's group memberships vary and come to be expressed. In sum, in order to understand the effects of anonymity, we need to pay close attention to the particulars of the situation under study.

Clearly, besides the ones we have examined, other factors associated with anonymity need further investigation, some of which we are aware is currently under way (e.g., Douglas & McGarty, this volume; Postmes & Spears, this volume; Sassenberg, this volume). In addition, although we believe that the research discussed in this paper provides some important clues as to the psychological processes involved in motivating group members to engage in pro-group behaviour, future research should attempt to further clarify the processes involved.

References

- Abrams, D., Wetherell, M., Cochrane, S., Hogg, M., & Turner, J. C. (1990). Knowing what to think by knowing who you are: Self-categorization and the nature of norm formation, conformity and group polarisation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *29*, 97-119.
- Asch, S. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: I. A minority of one against a unanimous majority. *Psychological monographs*, *70*, 1-70.
- Barreto, M. & Ellemers, N. (in press). You can't always do what you want: Social identity and self-presentational determinants of the choice to work for a low status group. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- Barreto, M. & Ellemers, N. (1999a). The choice to be influenced? The role of internal and external membership criteria in the development of loyalty to a low status group. Unpublished manuscript.
- Barreto, M. & Ellemers, N. (1999b). Processes of social influence: Degree of identification and type of anonymity as determinant of the choice to work on behalf of a low status group. Unpublished manuscript.
- Batson, C. D., Ahmad, N., Yin, J., Bedell, S. J., Johnson, J. W., Templin, C. M., & Whiteside, A. (1999). Two threats to the common good: Self-interested egoism and empathy-induced altruism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*, 1, 3-16.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1982). A self-presentational view of social phenomena. *Psychological Bulletin*, *91*, 1, 3-26.
- Deutsch, M. & Gerard, H. B. (1955). A study of normative and informational social influences upon individual judgement. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *51*, 629-636.
- Doosje, B., Ellemers, N., & Spears, R. (1999). Commitment and intergroup behaviour. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social Identity: Context, commitment, content*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ellemers, N. (1993). The influence of socio-structural variables on identity management strategies. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *4*, 27-57.
- Ellemers, N., Barreto, M., & Spears, R. (1999). Commitment and strategic responses to social context. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social Identity: Context, commitment, content*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ellemers, N., Kortekaas, P., & Ouwerkerk, J. W. (1999). Self-categorisation, commitment to the group, and self-esteem as related but distinct aspects of social identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *29*, 371-389.

- Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1997). Sticking together or falling apart: In-group identification as a psychological determinant of group commitment versus individual mobility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 3, 417-426.
- Ellemers, N., Van Dyck, C., Jacobs, A., & Hinkle, S. (1999). Intergroup differentiation in social context: Identity needs versus audience constraints. Manuscript under review.
- Ellemers, N., Van Knippenberg, A., De Vries, N. K., & Wilke, H. (1988). Social identification and permeability of group boundaries. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 18, 497-513.
- Emler, N. & Reicher, S. (1995). *Adolescence and delinquency: The collective management of reputation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Hogg, M. A. & Turner, J. C. (1987). Social identity and conformity: A theory of referent informational influence. In W. Doise & S. Moscovici (Eds) *Current Issues in European Social Psychology (vol. 2)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- James, K. & Cropanzano, R. (1994). Dispositional group loyalty and individual action for the benefit of an ingroup: Experimental and correlational evidence. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 60, 179-205.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R. & Manstead, A. S. R. (1997). Strength of identification and intergroup differentiation: The influence of group norms. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 816.1-7.
- Kelley, H. H. (1952). The two functions of reference groups. In G. E. Swanson, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology (410-14)*. NY: Holt.
- Kelly, C. (1993). Group identification, intergroup perceptions and collective action. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 4, 59-83.
- Le Bon, G. (1895/1995). *The crowd: A study of popular mind*. London: Transaction publishers.
- Lea, M., Spears, R., & De Groot, D. (1998). Knowing me, knowing you: Effects of visual anonymity on self-categorization, stereotyping and attraction in computer mediated groups. Unpublished manuscript.
- Leary, M. R. & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107, 1, 34-47.
- Martin, R. (1988). Ingroup and outgroup minorities: Differential impact upon public and private responses. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 18, 39-52.
- Noel, J. G., Wann, D. L., & Branscombe, N. R. (1995). Peripheral ingroup membership status and public negativity toward outgroups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 1, 127-137.
- Ouwerkerk, J. W., Ellemers, N. & De Gilder, D. (1999). Group commitment and individual effort in experimental and organizational contexts. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Plant, E. A. & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal and external motivations to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 3, 811-812.
- Postmes, T. (1997). *Social influence in computer-mediated groups*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (1998). Deindividuation and anti-normative behavior: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 123, 3, 238-259.
- Postmes, T., Spears, R., & Lea, M. (1999). Social identity, normative content and 'deindividuation' in computer-mediated groups. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social Identity: Context, commitment, content*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Postmes, T., Spears, R., & Lea, M. (in press). Breaching or building social boundaries? SIDE-effects of computer-mediated communication. *Communication Research*.
- Postmes, T., Spears, R., Sakhel, K., & De Groot, D. (1998). *Social influence in computer-mediated groups: The effects of anonymity on group behaviour*. Manuscript under review.
- Raven, B. H. & Kruglanski, A. W. (1970). Conflict and power. In: P. Swingle (Ed.), *The structure of conflict*. NY: Academic Press.
- Reicher, S. (1984). Social influence in the crowd; Attitudinal and behavioural effects of de-individuation in conditions of high and low group salience. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 341-350.
- Reicher, S. & Levine, M. (1994). Deindividuation, power relations between groups and the expression of social identity: The effects of visibility to the out-group. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 145-163.
- Reicher, S. & Levine, M. & Gordijn, E. (1998). More on deindividuation, power relations between groups and the expression of social identity: Three studies on the effects of visibility to the in-group. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 1, 15-40.
- Reicher, S. D., Spears, R. & Postmes, T. (1995). A social identity model of deindividuation phenomena. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 6, 161-198.

- Schlenker, B. (1980). *Impression management: The self-concept, social identity and interpersonal relations*. Monterey: Brooks/Cole.
- Spears, R., Doosje, B., & Ellemers, N. (1997). Self-stereotyping in the face of threats to group status and distinctiveness: The role of group identification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 538-53.
- Spears, R., Doosje, B., & Ellemers, N. (1999). Commitment and the context of social perception. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social Identity: Context, commitment, content*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Spears, R. & Lea, M. (1994). Panacea or panopticon? The hidden power of computer-mediated communication. *Communication Research*, *21*, 4, 427-459.
- Spears, R., Lea, M., & Lee, S. (1990). De-individuation and group polarization in computer-mediated communication. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *29*, 121-134.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). The social psychology of minorities. In H. Tajfel (Ed.) *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, C. A.: Brooks-Cole.
- Tarde, G. (1890/1921). *Les lois de l'imitation*. Paris: Librairie Felix Alcan.
- Tetlock, P. E. (1996). Accountability. In A. S. R. Manstead & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social Psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Turner, J. C. (1999). xxx
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987) *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorisation theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wann, D. L. & Branscombe, N. R. (1990). Die-Hard and Fair-Weather fans: Effects of identification on BIRGING and CORFING tendencies. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, *14*, 2, 103-117.
- Williams, K., Harkins, S. & Latané, B. (1981). Identifiability as a deterrent to social loafing: Two cheering experiments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *40*, 303-311.

Free University, Amsterdam
University of Leiden

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Manuela Barreto, Free University of Amsterdam, Department of Social Psychology, Van der Boerchorststraat 1, 1081 BT Amsterdam, The Netherlands, or M.Barreto@psy.vu.nl
This research was made possible by a fellowship of the European Community awarded to the first author (Training and Mobility of Researchers). We wish to thank Catia Silva for her assistance in collecting data for one of the studies reported here, and Tom Postmes, Russell Spears, Steve Reicher, and the participants of the SIDE conference (Amsterdam, 30 June – 2 July 1999) for their valuable comments.